

P25922.A06

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Initially, Applicant would like to express his appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action provided, for the acknowledgment of Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement by return of the Form PTO-1449, for the acknowledgment of Applicant's Claim for Priority and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document in the Official Action, and for the indication that the drawings are acceptable.

Applicant also acknowledges with appreciation the indication that claims 5 and 11 are allowable on the Office Action Summary and on Page 6 of the Official Action.

Upon entry of the above amendments claims 1 and 82 will have been amended, claims 47-50 have been canceled, and claim 97 has been added. Claims 1-46 and 51-90 and 97 are currently pending; with claims 14,16, 17, 19-46, 51-81 and 88-90 being withdrawn from consideration in a previous Official Action. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding objection and rejections, and allowance of all the claims pending in the present application.

As an initial matter, Applicant would like to thank the Examiner, Mrs. Phuongchi NGUYEN, for the courtesy of the telephone conversation extended to Applicant's attorney, Mr. Enoch Peavey on March 30, 2006. During the conversation, the Examiner indicated that she intended to cite to HUMPHREYS (U.S. Patent No. 4,243,284) on Page 4 of the Official Action instead of TAN (U.S. Patent No. 5,167,516). Therefore, reference numerals on Page 4 of the Official Action actually refer to features of HUMPHREYS. Accordingly, the Applicant will address the features of the present disclosure in relation to HUMPHREYS.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 7, 12-13 and 82-87 under

P25922.A06

35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by ROGERS et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,688,132); and

Claims 1, 3-10, 47 and 49-50 as being anticipated by HUMPHREYS (U.S. Patent No. 4,243, 284).

Although Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner's rejection of the claims on these grounds, nevertheless, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 82 to clearly obviate the above-noted grounds of rejection in order to expedite prosecution of the present application. In this regard, Applicant notes that Rodgers and Humphreys fail to teach or suggest the combination of elements as recited in amended claim 1. In particular, claim 1, as amended, sets forth an electrical power supply including, inter alia, a conductive member disposed between the opening and the at least one conductor and arranged to be electrically connected to a connector, wherein the conductive member is resiliently displaceable by said connector between a first position in which the member prevents access of said connector to the at least one conductor and a second position in which the member allows said connector to be electrically connected to the at least one conductor.

Applicant submits that Rodgers and Humphreys, alone or in any proper combination, lack any disclosure of the aforementioned features.

The Examiner cites to ROGERS as purportedly teaching the electrical power supply distribution apparatus of the present disclosure. In particular, the Examiner characterizes the elongated grounding conductor (G) as being a conductive member, as recited in amended claim 1. However, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the grounding conductor (G) is very different structurally from the conductive member of the

P25922.A06

present disclosure. In this regard, the grounding conductor (G) is received in a central slot (as shown in FIG. 2), and is deflected by the plug stud when the plug is inserted into the opening. Further, the ground plug (10g) is NOT positioned such that it can prevent the other prongs (P1 and P2) from contacting the wire conductors L1 and L2. This is in direct contrast to the conductive member of an embodiment of the present disclosure, which requires that the resilient member be depressed downwardly (see the last Para. beginning on page 12 and ending on page 13) to allow the connector to access the electrical conductors. Thus, ROGERS does not disclose the conductive member being resiliently displaceable by the connector between a first position in which the member prevents access of the connector to the at least one conductor and a second position in which the member allows said connector to be electrically connected to the at least one conductor.

Further, the aforementioned features of the present disclosure have at least the advantages of securely grounding the connector before the electrical conductors can be engaged, and a safety feature of preventing accidental touching (engagement) of the electrical conductors because such access is only possible when the conductive member has been properly displaced.

In regard to HUMPHERRYS, the Examiner cites to the contacts and earth pin (77,78, and 80) as purportedly being elongated conductors, as recited in amended claim 1. However, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, the contact and earth pins are part of the plug body (70) and NOT the conduit 29 (see Col. 7, lines 32-44 and FIG. 4). Further, the Examiner has interpreted the spring 55 as being the conductive member (see Page 4, para. 3 of the Official Action). However, because the springs (55) are

P25922.A06

disposed on a back side of the door (52) they can not come into electrical contact with the connector, i.e., the contacts and earth pin (77,78, and 80, see FIG. 5).

Thus, HUMPPHERYS does not disclose, among other things, a conduit including at least one elongate conductor... and a conductive member disposed between the opening and the at least one conductor and arranged to be electrically connected to a connector, wherein the conductive member is resiliently displaceable by said connector between a first position in which the member prevents access of said connector to the at least one conductor and a second position in which the member allows said connector to be electrically connected to the at least one conductor; as required by amended claim 1.

Applicant further submits that independent claim 82, as amended, is similar to independent claim 1 in that it recites, inter alia, a conductive member disposed between the opening and the at least one conductor and arranged to be electrically connected to a said connector, wherein the conductive member is resiliently displaceable by a said connector between a first position in which the member prevents access of said connector to the at least one conductor and a second position in which the member allows said connector to be electrically connected to the at least one conductor.

Thus, claim 82 is allowable for reasons similar to claim 1. Accordingly, the rejections of claims 1 and 82 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) are improper for all the above reasons and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Absent a disclosure in a single reference of each and every element recited in a claim, a *prima facie* case of anticipation cannot be made under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Since the applied reference fails to disclose each and every element recited in

P25922.A06

independent claim 1 as well as claim 3 dependent therefrom, these claims are not anticipated thereby. Further, all pending dependent claims recite additional features that further define the present invention over the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and allow all pending claims in the present application.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 15 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ROGERS in view of NADEAU (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,328); and

Claim 48 over ROGERS alone, and further as being an obvious duplication of essential working parts.

Applicant respectfully traverses the above noted rejections of claims 15 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicant submits that dependent claims 15 and 18 are at least patentable due to their respective dependencies from claim 1 for the reasons noted above. In this regard, Applicant notes that the Examiner has provided no explanation or motivation for correcting the above-noted deficiencies in the teachings of ROGERS. Applicant further submits that NADEAU does not provide any teachings which could reasonably be characterized as curing the above-noted deficiencies in the teachings of ROGERS. In this regard, Applicant submits that ROGERS and NADEAU do not disclose a conductive member disposed between the opening and the at least one conductor and arranged to be electrically connected to a connector, wherein the conductive member is resiliently displaceable by said connector between a first position in which the member prevents access of said connector to the at least one conductor and a second position in which

P25922.A06

the member allows said connector to be electrically connected to the at least one conductor.

In regard to the rejection of claim 48, without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejection, claim 48 has been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claim 48 is believed to be moot.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 15 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper for all the above reasons and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Additionally, Applicant notes that new claim 97 recites a further aspect of an embodiment of the present disclosure, and is at least patentable because it depends from claim 1, which Applicant has shown to be allowable; and because it recites additional features of the invention and is also separately patentable over the prior art of record.

In view of the remarks/arguments herein, Applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 82 are in condition for allowance. With regard to dependent claims 2-13, 15, 18, 82-87 and 97 Applicant asserts that they are allowable on their own merit, as well as because they depend from independent claims 1 and 82, which Applicant has shown to be allowable.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-13, 15, 18, 82-87, and 97, in the present application are clearly patentable over the references cited by the Examiner, either alone or in combination, and an indication to such effect is respectfully requested, in due course.

In view of the allowability of independent claims 1 and 82 as noted above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to rejoin withdrawn claims 14, 16, 17 and 88 which

P25922.A06

depend therefrom, and indicate the allowability of at least these claims, as well as any other of the withdrawn claims which may be deemed allowable by the Examiner.

SUMMARY

Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully request an indication to that effect. Applicant has argued the allowability of the claims and pointed out deficiencies of the applied reference. Accordingly, reconsideration of the outstanding Official Action and allowance of the present application and all the claims therein are respectfully requested and is now believed to be appropriate.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Choon JONG

Will E. Lyddane

Bruce H. Bernstein William E. Lyddane
Reg. No. 29,027 Reg. No. 41,568

April 28, 2006
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1941 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191